

## **REMARKS**

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the claimed invention. Claims 1-38 are pending. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,832,481 (*Sheffield*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,704,029 (*Wright*). This rejection is fully traversed below.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that *Sheffield* teaches automatically creating the report or layout in the context of the invention. (Final Office Action, page 3) To support this assertion, the Examiner has stated that *Sheffield* teaches populating fields from a script into areas such as summary area of a DataWindow. (Final Office Action, page 3) It is respectfully submitted that merely populating fields from a script into an area of a display window does not teach or suggest automatically creating a report or layout for data stored in a database in the context of the invention (i.e., based on the interview sequence). Moreover, it is earnestly believed that *Sheffield* does not teach or suggest automatically creating a report or layout in the context of the invention. Thus, to overcome the deficiencies of *Sheffield*, the Examiner needs to at least assert that *Wright* teaches performing an interview sequence to obtain information pertaining to data stored in a database. However, *Wright* does not pertain to a database or database program. *Wright* pertains to a system and method for providing computerized forms completion and processing. It is noted that *Wright* describes a form engine that presents a single item or question to the user (*Wright*, Col. 3, lines 40-55). However, there is no teaching in *Wright* with respect to performing an interview sequence to obtain information pertaining to data stored in a database. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that *Wright* and *Sheffield* taken alone, or taken in any proper combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Furthermore, it should be noted that claim 1, among other things, recites that the organized information is associated with the database and a database program performs the interview sequence and automatically generate the report or layout based on the organized information. Clearly, *Wright* and *Sheffield* taken alone or taken in any proper combination do not teach or suggest a database program that performs any of these operations. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over

*Wright* and *Sheffield* taken alone, or taken in any proper combination, for these additional reasons.

Still further, claim 1, among other things, additionally recites that the database program operates to automatically create the report or layout without requiring a programming script to be written by a human. Clearly, neither *Wright*, nor *Sheffield* teach or suggest this feature. *Sheffield* teaches away from this feature because it teaches programming a script to display information on a window. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over *Wright* and *Sheffield* taken alone, or taken in any proper combination, for yet additional reasons.

Independent claims 17 and 31 recite similar features as those recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 17 and 31 claims and their dependent claims are also patentable over *Sheffield* and *Wright* for similar reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-38 are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. CLARP026).

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



R. Mahboubian  
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 778  
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778  
(650) 961-8300